Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-20 and 22-23 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 20 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 10, and 20 are sought to be amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 20 may be found, for example, at paragraphs [0109] and [0110] of the published application. Claims 12, 13, and 24-27 are sought to be cancelled. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-20, and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner alleges, in respective language, that the feature "said single byte comprising an entry number for said header lookup table and an unmodified Payload Type Identifier" as recited by claims 1 and 20 is not supported by the originally filed specification. (Office Action, pages 4-5). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

An exemplary compressed ATM header, comprising a single byte that includes a 4-bit entry number for a header lookup table **and** a 3-bit Payload Type Identifier (PTI), is

illustrated in FIG. 2, element 240 and described at paragraph [0110] of the specification, which states:

> [T]he compressed header 240 comprises one byte of header information, with bits [7 . . . 5] containing Payload Type Identification (PTI) bits, and with bits [3 . . . 0] containing an entry number of the header lookup table 300.

The PTI bits of the ATM header undergoing compression "**are copied without modification to the bits [7 . . . 5] of the compressed header**." (Specification, paragraph [0110].) (Emphasis added.)

The unmodified PTI bits are included within the compressed header such that the ATM header can be properly decompressed. This is evident from the exemplary description at paragraphs [0114] and [0115] of the specification, which describes the decompression process. As described at paragraph [0115], the header lookup table entry number, contained within the compressed header, "is used for addressing [a] header lookup table" to retrieve "the first four bytes of the corresponding full size ATM header, **whereby the PTI bits...have been set to zero**." (Emphasis added.) To fully recover the four bytes retrieved from the header lookup table, "**the PTI bits of the compressed header**...are copied to the respective bit positions of the ATM header." (Specification, paragraph [0115].) (Emphasis added.)

Based on the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the feature "said single byte comprising an entry number for a header lookup table and an unmodified Payload Type Identifier copied from the primary header" as recited by claims 1 and 20 is fully supported by the originally filed specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-20, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 12, 13, and 24-27 have been canceled by the above amendment, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Bornemisza

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, 18, 19, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,154,895 to Bornemisza et al. ("Bornemisza"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1 recites features that distinguish over the applied reference. For example, claim 1 as amended herein recites "wherein said header compression unit comprises at least one header lookup table that includes an entry corresponding to a portion of said primary header, wherein a Payload Type Identifier of said primary header is replaced by zeros within said entry." As will be explained further below, Bornemisza does not teach or suggest of such a feature.

Bornemisza is directed to a system and method for ATM header compression. (Bornemisza, col. 2, lines 6-7.) Specifically, Bornemisza describes three techniques for ATM header compression: a differential technique, a dictionary technique, and a multi-cell technique. (Bornemisza, col. 2, lines 10-13.) Bornemisza does not describe any header lookup table, in relation to these three techniques, "that includes an entry corresponding to a portion of said primary header, **wherein a Payload Type Identifier of said primary header is replaced by zeros within said entry**" as recited by claim 1. (Emphasis added.)

For at least the foregoing reason, independent claim 1 is patentable over Bornemisza. Dependent claims 2-3, 5-9, 18 and 19 are similarly patentable over Bornemisza for at least the same reason as claim 1, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1-3, 5-9, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 24-26 have been canceled by the above amendment, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims moot.

Agarwal and Bornemisza

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, 10-17, 20, 24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,963,570 to Agarwal ("Agarwal") in view of Bornemisza. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1 and 20 recite features that distinguish over the applied references. For example, claims 1 and 20 as amended herein recite "wherein said header compression unit comprises at least one header lookup table that includes an entry corresponding to a portion of said primary header, wherein a Payload Type Identifier of said primary header is replaced by zeros within said entry." As will be explained further below, the combination of Agarwal and Bornemisza does not teach or suggest of such a feature.

Agarwal is directed to an apparatus for compressing ATM headers. (Agarwal, at Abstract.) Several portions of Agarwal disclose the use of a header compression table

for compressing ATM headers. For example, in FIG. 4 of Agarwal, a header compression table, referred to as H-table 1340, is used to compress a 4-octet ATM header value into an "n" bit index value. (Agarwal, col. 11, lines 49-53.) Agarwal describes that the "n" bit index value corresponds to an entry within the compression table that matches the 4-octet ATM header. (*Id.*) Although Agarwal discloses the use of compression tables, Agarwal does **not** disclose that a Payload Type Identifier, for any one of the 4-octet ATM headers stored within the compression tables, are replaced by zeros.

Thus, Agarwal does not teach or suggest "wherein said header compression unit comprises at least one header lookup table that includes an entry corresponding to a portion of said primary header, **wherein a Payload Type Identifier of said primary header is replaced by zeros within said entry**" as recited by claims 1 and 20. (Emphasis Added.). As noted above, Bornemisza does not cure the deficiencies of Agarwal.

For at least the foregoing reason, independent claims 1 and 20 are patentable over Bornemisza and Agarwal. Dependent claims 5, 10, 11, 14-17 are similarly patentable over the combination of Bornemisza and Agarwal for at least the same reason as claim 1, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1, 5, 10, 11, 14-17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 12, 13, and 24-27 have been canceled by the above amendment, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims moot.

Agarwal, Bornemisza, and Rosengard

The Examiner has rejected claims 22 and 23 as allegedly being unpatentable over Agarwal, in view of Bornemisza, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,760,345 to Rosengard ("Rosengard"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Rosengard does not cure the deficiencies of Agarwal and Bornemisza with respect to independent claim 20 as noted above. Consequently, independent claim 20 is patentable over the combination of Agarwal, Bornemisza, and Rosengard. Dependent claims 22 and 23 are similarly patentable over the combination of Agarwal, Bornemisza, and Rosengard for the same reason as claim 20, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Glenn J. Perry
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 28,458

Date: 27 Feb. 2009

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
915421_1.DOC